



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,171	10/31/2003	Gary Howard	CEO-001.03	9909
25181	7590	02/17/2006	EXAMINER	
FOLEY HOAG, LLP PATENT GROUP, WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST 155 SEAPORT BLVD BOSTON, MA 02110			HOLMES, MICHAEL B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2121	

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/698,171

Applicant(s)

HOWARD ET AL.

Examiner

Michael B. Holmes

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on December 01, 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 – [www.USPTO.GOV](http://www.USPTO.GOV)

### Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. This Office Action is responsive to communication received on December 01, 2005. Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.111 reconsideration and allowance of application is respectfully requested by applicant.
2. Applicant's has elected not to amend the claims. Moreover, arguments have been fully considered, however, they are not persuasive. The 35 USC § 102(e) & 35 USC § 102(a) rejection stands. The complete text of which has been included below.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

Art Unit: 2121

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1, 4-7, 10-12, 14 & 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Straforini et al.* (USPN 6,092,059).

Regarding claims 1, 4-7, 10-12, 14 & 15. *Straforini et al.* teaches generating classification outputs from a first data classifier based on first data elements, using the classification outputs and the first data elements to generate rules relating the first data elements and the classification outputs, a first data classifier configured to generate, based on first data elements, classification outputs, and a rule inducer configured to use the first data elements and the classification outputs to generate rules relating the first data elements and the classification outputs, generating classification outputs based on first data elements provided to a first data classifier, and generate rules relating the first data elements and the classification outputs, based on the first data elements and the classification outputs [see Abstract, C 3, L 47 to C 4, L 17, C 17, L 23-35, Fig. 3, C 10, L 49 to C 11, L 43].

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2121

7. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9 & 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Straforini et al.* (USPN 6,092,059) in view of *Rangachar* (USPN 5,495,521).

*Straforini et al.* has been discussed above and does not explicitly describe the limitations of claims 2, 3, 8, 9 & 13. However, *Rangachar* describe the limitations of claims 2, 3, 8, 9 & 13.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 8, 9 & 13. the first data elements include data based on usage of a telecommunications network and the data include call detail records [see Abstract]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the art to combine *Straforini et al.* with *Rangachar* because fraudulent telephone calls are a major source of revenue loss to telephone service providers [see C 1, L 24-25].

### Response to Arguments

8. Examiner has reviewed and taken into considerations applicant's arguments. Applicant has present ed a broad set of claims, such that examiner contends the art of record reads on i.e., a first data classifier based on a first data elements etc. [see Abstract & FIG. 3, C3L 47 to C4, L 17].

### Examiners Summary

9. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

10. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2121

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### Correspondence Information

11. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael B. Holmes, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3686 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3686 or email [Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov](mailto:Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov).

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (703) 746-7239.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight, may be reached at (571) 272-3687.

Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist @ (Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22313), located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building.

  
**Anthony Knight**  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3600

**Michael B. Holmes**  
Patent Examiner  
Artificial Intelligence  
Art Unit 2121  
United States Department of Commerce  
Patent & Trademark Office

Application/Control Number: 10/698,171

Page 6

Art Unit: 2121

*Tuesday, February 14, 2006*

*MBH*